



New Jersey and several other individuals residing in New Jersey for \$11,222.00 in damages based on this Court's diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiff's allegations surround an alteration to a will in New Jersey probate court that allegedly caused him financial harm. Based on these allegations, it is likely that this Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims. Accordingly, the appointment of counsel is not warranted.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and only have authority to hear a case if it falls under one of two categories of federal jurisdiction: (1) federal question, 28 U.S.C. § 1331 or (2) diversity jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Plaintiff does not assert a federal cause of action in this case so as to fall under this Court's federal-question jurisdiction, and his Complaint states that he is proceeding under this Court's diversity jurisdiction. This Court has diversity jurisdiction where a lawsuit is between citizens of different states (as here) and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 based on the facts as alleged on the face of the plaintiff's complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a); *Allen v. R & H Oil & Gas Co.*, 63 F.3d 1326, 1335 (5th Cir. 1995). Plaintiff's Complaint states that the amount in controversy is \$11,222.00. (Compl. [#1] at 4.) Accordingly, based on the face of Plaintiff's Complaint, his lawsuit does not fall under either statutory basis for this Court's subject matter jurisdiction. The Court will not appoint counsel under these circumstances.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel [#3] is **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 13th day of August, 2019.



ELIZABETH S. ("BETSY") CHESTNEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE